



AF/2174

Attorney Docket No. 23452-096

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICANT: Frank A. Pavelski

SERIAL NUMBER: 09/337,538

EXAMINER: Tran, Mylinh T.

FILING DATE: June 22, 1999

ART UNIT: 2174

FOR:

SYSTEM AND METHOD FOR CUSTOMIZING WORKSPACE
USING PREDEFINED FRAMESETS

BOX AF

Assistant Commissioner for Patents
Washington, D.C. 20231

RECEIVED

JUN 21 2002

Technology Center 2100

TRANSMITTAL LETTER

Enclosed herewith are the following documents regarding the above-identified non-provisional patent application:

1. Response After Final Rejection Under 37 C.F.R § 1.116 (4 pgs.)
2. Return postcard.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fee that may be due, or to credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. **50-0311** (Reference No. 23452-096). A duplicate copy of this transmittal letter is enclosed.

Respectfully submitted,

Brian P. Hopkins, Reg. No. 42,669
Attorneys for Applicant
c/o MINTZ, LEVIN, COHN, FERRIS,
GLOVSKY and POPEO, P.C.
11911 Freedom Drive, Suite 400
Reston, Virginia 20190
Tel. No.: (703) 464-4800

Dated: June 19, 2002



29315

PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE

PATENT APPLICATION
EXPEDITED PROCEDURE UNDER
37 C.F.R. § 1.116
GROUP ART UNIT 2174



Attorney Docket No.: 23452-096

#11

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICANTS: Frank A. Pavelski
SERIAL NUMBER: 09/337,538 EXAMINER: Tran, Mylinh T.
FILING DATE: June 22, 1999 ART UNIT: 2174
FOR: SYSTEM AND METHOD FOR CUSTOMIZING WORKSPACE
USING PREDEFINED FRAMESETS

BOX AF
Assistant Commissioner for Patents
Washington, D.C. 20231

RECEIVED
JUN 21 2002
Technology Center 2100

RESPONSE AFTER FINAL REJECTION

Dear Sir:

In response to the outstanding Office Action of April 19, 2002 (paper no. 9),
Applicants submit the following remarks.

The application has been thoroughly reviewed in light of the outstanding Office
Action. Claims 1-28 are pending, with claims 1, 8, 15 and 22 independent. Each one of the
points of the Office Action are addressed below.

§103 Rejection

Claims 1-28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable U.S. patent no.
6,266,684 (Krause et al.) in view of U.S. patent no. 6,014,137 (Burns). For the following
reasons, Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

The Invention

Claim 1 is directed to a system for enabling a user to create a frameset arrangement for a view. The system includes a predefined frameset arrangement presentation object that presents a plurality of predefined frameset arrangements to a user through a graphical user interface, where the plurality of predefined frameset arrangements are displayed as objects to a user. The system also includes a predefined frameset selection object that enables a user to select a predefined frameset arrangement through the graphical user interface and a view presentation object that presents a view to the user having the predefined frameset arrangement selected. System claim 8, method claim 15, and computer medium claim 22 recite the same patentable features.

It is a feature of the present invention that a plurality of predefined frameset arrangements are displayed as objects to the user, so that the user may easily select a frameset arrangement of choice for customizing a layout. This system allows an author to quickly select a frameset arrangement from a plurality of framesets to display selected information during authoring.

The Prior Art

Kraus et al. is understood by Applicants to be directed to a web page authoring program for allowing a user to create a multiple-frame web-page by manipulating a graphical display representing a web page during authoring. Burns is understood by Applicants to disclose an electronic kiosk authoring system for developing and maintaining user interface screens for multimedia kiosk systems. The authoring system uses object oriented programming to define specialized object classes for instantiation on individual kiosk interface screens, which (as a result of such authoring) produces characteristic screens having selection buttons to guide a user of the screen to additional information.

Analysis

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three criteria are required. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must have taught or suggested to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made all the claim limitations at the time the invention was made. See M.P.E.P. 2143.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that the outstanding rejection under § 103 fails at least to meet the third requirement of *prima facie* obviousness, in that Kraus et al. and Burns, when taken alone or in combination would not have taught or suggested to one of skill in the art at the time the invention was made of all the claim limitations. Specifically, Kraus et al. and Burns do not teach or suggest a plurality of predefined frameset arrangements being displayed as objects to the user.

Applicants respectfully submit that, at most, Kraus et al. teaches and suggests graphically producing a single frameset for a web page. In addition, although the Office Action states that Burns teaches or suggest a multimedia kiosk authoring system having *framesets* in the system, and that “the framesets that [sic] are displayed as objects to a user (Figure 2A column 5, lines 56-67).” Applicants submit that there is no teaching, suggestion, or disclosure of framesets in this reference. Moreover, Figure 2A of Burns, and its cited corresponding text in the specification (column 5, lines 56-67) describe a characteristic exemplary screen layout of a kiosk system, displaying a plurality of buttons 21 which, upon selection, the main screen displays information about the topic associated with the button. Buttons 21 in no way remotely resemble the framesets and are not objects according to the claimed invention (or objects as taught by Burns for that matter) but are actually links to information associated with the topic (e.g., word topic, picture, and the like), which directs a user of the kiosk to the information. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that Figure 2A and

its associated text have nothing to do with the authoring system except that it is the result of such authoring.

Accordingly, for at least those reasons, claims 1, 8, 10 and 22 are patentable over the prior art. Since the remainder of the claims are dependent upon one or another of the independent claims, they are believed patentable for the same reasons. To that end, Applicants respectfully request that the outstanding objection be withdrawn.


CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicant submit that the issues raised in the outstanding Office Action have all been addressed. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration and early passage to issue of the present application.

It is believed that no fees are due in connection with filing this Response. In the event that it is determined that fees are due, however, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge the undersigned's Deposit Account No. 50-0311.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our Reston office by telephone at (703) 464-4800. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our address given below.

Respectfully submitted,

 42,450 For

Brian P. Hopkins, Reg. No. 42,669
Attorney for Applicant
c/o Mintz Levin Cohn Ferris
Glovsky & Popeo, P.C.

Date: 6/19/02
11911 Freedom Drive, Suite 400
Reston, Virginia 20190
Tel. No.: (703) 464-4800